REMARKS

Claims 1-43 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-43 over Gouda

In the Office Action, claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Microsoft article Anti-Replay Window Protocols for Secure IP to Mohamed G. Gouda et al. ("Gouda"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-43 recite **increasing** a size of a range of acceptable nonce values within an acceptance window or replay mask, where the **size** of the range is **based on** a largest nonce value yet seen.

Gouda appears to disclose an anti-replay window protocol that is used to secure IP against an adversary that can insert (possible replay) messages in a message stream between two computers (see Abstract). According to Gouda, a window w of sequence numbers (disclosed in section II) is partitioned into two smaller sub-windows of equal size (see page 313, right col., last paragraph). Each smaller sub-window (the window having the higher sequence number being called the head window, and the other being called the tail window) having u successive sequence numbers, and the larger window having a sequence number range of w=2*u, where u is a number of sequence numbers (see Gouda, page 313, right col., last paragraph). Neither the window w nor the sub-windows are **increased** in size based on a changing value, much less increased in size based on a largest nonce value yet seen, as recited by claims 1-43.

Section II, Case iii of Gouda appears to discuss use of a largest sequence number yet seen simply as a determination as to whether to deliver a message (see Gouda, Case iii). Gouda instructs that once the message is delivered, "q slides the window such that s becomes the new right edge of the window." (see Gouda, Case iii).

After delivery of the message, Gouda's window **slides** to the right, but Gouda's **size** of the range is <u>NOT **increased** based on a largest nonce value yet seen</u>, as recited by claims 1-43.

A benefit of increasing a **size** <u>of range of acceptable nonce values within</u> an acceptance window or replay mask **based on** <u>a largest nonce value yet seen</u> is, e.g., to reduce confusion between sessions. Increasing the **size** of a range of an acceptance window or replay mask, such as when starting a new session or when resetting a nonce value, permits new advantages. For instance, a previous session's large nonce value may play havoc on a new session starting with small nonce values. When switching sessions to restrict acceptance of a previous session's large nonce values the inventors have discovered that there are advantages to narrow an acceptance window or replay mask. Then once a session is underway, it is found that an acceptance window or replay mask should be increased to prevent unnecessary rejection of data associated with nonce values. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-43 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, NW 7TH Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df